

**Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000**  
**Public Law 106-393**

**Title II Project Application**  
**COOS BAY DISTRICT**  
**Resource Advisory Committee**

**1. Project Number** (Assigned by federal unit): CB02-URA5

<b>2. Project Name:</b> Church Creek Culvert Pull	<b>3. County:</b> Douglas
<b>4. Project Sponsor:</b> Pat Olmstead	<b>5. Date:</b> 2/14/02
<b>6. Sponsor's Phone Number:</b> (541) 756-0100	
<b>7. Sponsors E-mail:</b> Terri_Colby@or.blm.gov	

**8. Project Location** (see attached project area map)

Umpqua Subbasin (17100303)

Lower Smith River Fifth Field Watershed (1710030307)

West Fork Smith River Subwatershed

Township 19S, Range 08W, Section 31

Coos Bay BLM District

Umpqua Field Office

State / Private / Other lands involved? No

**9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:**

This is a watershed restoration project whose primary goals are to reduce existing risks to aquatic species/habitats and to restore habitat quality and connectivity for aquatic and riparian dependent species. The project is designed to implement objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, as described in the Northwest Forest Plan including maintaining and restoring: watershed complexity, aquatic ecosystem connectivity, water quality, natural instream flows, sediment regimes, and native species.

**10. Project Description:** (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)

This project proposes to remove a perched 48" culvert and approximately 150 feet of abandoned road fill from the Church Creek floodplain. The removed fill will be disposed of at an established site outside of the floodplain. Once the fill is removed the original floodplain elevation will be re-established. Exposed soils will be seeded, mulched, and fertilized as necessary for erosion control.

Currently the culvert is perched (elevated above the streambed on the outlet end) and prohibits resident and anadromous fish, as well as amphibian, passage into Church Creek. The upstream end of the culvert is almost completely plugged with debris. Furthermore, the road fill covers the entire width of the floodplain constricting the stream and significantly limiting floodplain function.

**Title II Project Application**  
**COOS BAY DISTRICT**  
**Resource Advisory Committee**

**11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?**

Yes. This project compliments other restoration projects done in the West Fork Smith River Subwatershed within the past 5 years. These projects have been implemented to restore function to the West Fork and several tributaries.

**12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation?** [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

- ☒ Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]
- ☒ Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]
- ☒ Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

**13. Project Type** (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

- ☒ Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
- ☒ Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]
- ☒ Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

**14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes** [Sec. 203(b)(5)]

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| a. Total Acres: N/A   | b. Total Miles: 1.0        |
| c. No. Structures: 1 culvert removed                            | d. Est. People Reached N/A |
| e. No. Laborer Days: 20   |                            |
| f. Other (specify): abandoned road fill removed from floodplain |                            |

**15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date:** [Sec. 203(b)(2)]

**Duration:** 5 days      **Completion Date:** September 2002

**16. Target Species Benefited:** (if applicable)

This project is expected to benefit a variety of fish and wildlife species including, but not limited to coho salmon, steelhead trout, and cutthroat trout.

**17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved?** [Sec. 2(b)(3)]

This project is expected to foster cooperative relationships among individuals and groups with diverse interests because it focuses on an area of agreement rather than controversy. Regardless of differing views on other aspects of public land management, clean water and healthy streams, and supporting stable populations of native fish and wildlife species are long-term ecological goals that most Coos Bay District user's support.

**Title II Project Application**  
**COOS BAY DISTRICT**  
**Resource Advisory Committee**

**18. How is this project in the best public interest?** [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities.**

This project is considered to be in the best public interest because it contributes positively toward maintaining and enhancing water quality and fish and wildlife habitat for both current and future generations of Federal Land users. Additionally, implementation of the project may benefit the community by providing local employment opportunities.

**19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?**

The project will improve fish passage to spawning and rearing habitat upstream of the culvert. It will also help improve habitat access and increase population viability for other vertebrate and invertebrate species that exist on public land by increasing habitat connectivity.

**20. Status of Project Planning**

- |   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| a. NEPA Complete:                                 |     | No |
| If no, give est. date of completion: April 2002   |     |    |
| c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:         | Yes |    |
| d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:        | Yes |    |
| e. Survey & Manage Complete:                      |     | No |
| f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained: |     | No |
| g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:     |     | No |
| h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:                    |     | No |
| i. Project Design(s) Completed:                   |     | No |

\* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer

**21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment**

☒ Contract

**22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials?** [Sec. 204(e)(3)]

No.

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000  
Public Law 106-393

**Title II Project Application**  
**COOS BAY DISTRICT**  
**Resource Advisory Committee**

**23. Anticipated Project Costs** [Sec. 203(b)(3)]

- a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$9,500
- b. Is this a multi-year funding request? No

**Table 1. Project Cost Analysis**

Item	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
	Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Total Available Funds
24. Project Development/NEPA		\$2,000		\$ 2,000
25. Contracting*		\$6,000		\$ 6,000
26. Monitoring		\$1,500		\$ 1,500
<b>27. Total Cost Estimate</b>				<b>\$9,500</b>

\* Contracting includes project design and implementation

**28. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above** [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

Agency appropriated funds may be available at some time in the future, but currently there are more restoration opportunities than there is funding available.

**29. Monitoring Plan** [Sec. 203(b)(6)]

- a. **What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] **Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?**

**BLM Fisheries Biologist** - Monitoring will be done primarily through spawning surveys above the site to determine fish passage, photo points to document visible changes, and pebble counts to determine substrate retention.

**Title II Project Application  
COOS BAY DISTRICT  
Resource Advisory Committee**

- b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?**

**The District Manager** – This project will be considered successful at emphasizing local employment and training opportunities if local contractors are hired to complete the road improvement work and if local contractors, high school students, YCC groups, or other local interest groups are trained and utilized to complete monitoring activities

- c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from federal lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?**

NA.

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks.**

Amount: \$1,500.00

**Title II Project Application**  
**COOS BAY DISTRICT**  
**Resource Advisory Committee**

**County Commissioner Concurrence**

(Majority Required per charter)

A majority of the county commissioners of \_\_\_\_\_ County have reviewed this proposed Public Law 106-393 project for the BLM Coos Bay District Advisory Council and agree with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

---

Attested by Commissioner

---

Date

Comments/Rational: